sentence, his punishment for escape would be one year, while a convict serving a twenty-year sentence would be punished for exactly the same offense by being imprisoned just twenty times as long. The method of determining the punishment for one confined for life, attempting to escape, is not made clear. This statute was alleged to deny equal protection to all persons charged with its violation and to be unreasonable and class legislation. To say that the long-time convict is more culpable for precisely the same behavior, is absurd. The punishment for such escape would be not upon the act of escaping a prison, but upon the act of escaping a punishment fixed by the judgment of conviction. The statute, however, makes the escape from the state prison the offense, and not the escape from the punishment of the judgment fixed by the court upon trial. In Ex parte Mallon, 102 Pacific Reporter, 374, the Idaho Supreme Court held this statute unconstitutional.

Prohibiting Seining in Vicinity of Docks.—The town of Santa Monica passed an ordinance prohibiting seining within 1,000 feet of its docks. In Ex parte Bailey, 101 Pacific Reporter, 441, the California Supreme Court thought it manifest from the terms of the ordinance that it was in no sense designed for the preservation and protection of fish for the benefit of the state. It was clearly the sole object of the ordinance to protect and add to the piscatorial advantages of the wharves, docks, and piers in the town, and to increase the fortune of the wielders of hook and line. This being the purpose of the ordinance, it was clearly beyond the power of the town to enact.

Soliciting Business by Attorney.—In Washington an attorney is prohibited from soliciting employment either directly or indirectly. A breach of these restrictions is termed barratry, for which the offender may be disbarred. Appellant in State *v.* Rossman, 101 Pacific Reporter, 357, had been charged with slander, perjury, fraud upon those employed to solicit business, and barratry. He contended that the right to practice law was a natural right guaranteed by the Constitution, and the barratry statute deprived him of his right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness in that he was forbidden to use his faculties as he chose in his vocation. The Washington Supreme Court thought the disbarment proper, remarking that the practice of law is not a constitutional right, but one granted by the state, which may surround it with reasonable restrictions.

Power of Courts to Punish for Contempt.—A Missouri statute prohibits courts from punishing contempts by fine exceeding $50 or imprisonment for more than 10 days. In Chicago, B. & Q. Ry. Co. *v.* Gildersleeve, 118 Southwestern Reporter, 86, it appeared that appellant had disregarded an injunction forbidding his traffic in partly used